



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,973	02/27/2002	David D. Kiefer	210_271	6900
20874	7590	07/19/2004	EXAMINER	
WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI 101 SOUTH SALINA STREET SUITE 400 SYRACUSE, NY 13202			BECKER, DREW E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,973

Applicant(s)

KIEFER ET AL.

Examiner

Drew E Becker

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group II in the reply filed on June 28, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that applicant has amended non-elected claim 1. This is not found persuasive because claim 1 had previously been withdrawn from consideration in the last office action. In addition, group I has a separate classification and therefore would have required a separate search.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. This application contains claims 1-8 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the conversation of May 20, 2004. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Badalament et al [Pat. No. 6,012,384] in view of Briscoe Jr et al [Pat. No. 6,390,378].

Badalament et al teach a mobile container device comprising a pair of plenum chambers extending rearwardly from a mixing chamber (Figure 4, #34 & 40), stacked rows of cartons (Figure 4, #24), vertically stacked fan means (Figure 4, #60), a gas generator (Figure 2, #116), a fresh air exchanger unit in the form of the rear doors (column 6, line 45), a return air inlet (Figure 7, #56), and pressure bars (Figure 4, #70).

Badalament et al do not recite a control means for the fresh air exchanger, gas generator, and fans. Briscoe Jr et al teach a mobile container device comprising a control means for a fresh air exchanger, gas generator, and fans (Figure 2, #5; column 8, lines 12-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the controller of Briscoe Jr et al into the invention of Badalament et al since both are directed to mobile container devices, since Badalament et al already included fans, a gas generator, and a fresh air exchanger (Figures 2-4, #60, 116; column 6, line 45), and since the control means of Briscoe Jr et al would have provided automatic control of these elements and hence improved efficiency. Phrases such as "to activate the fans in a given order" are merely preferred methods of using the claimed apparatus.

5. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Badalament et al, in view of Briscoe Jr et al, as applied above, and further in view of Hearne Jr [Pat. No. 6,202,434].

Badalament et al and Briscoe Jr et al teach the above mentioned components. Briscoe Jr et al also teach control of automatic drain valves (column 7, line 65; column 8, line 46). Badalament et al and Briscoe Jr et al do not teach drains in the floor. Hearnes Jr teaches a mobile container device comprising drains in the floor (Figure 1, #114). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the floor drains of Hearne Jr into the invention of Badalament et al, in view of Briscoe Jr et al, since all are directed to mobile container devices, since Badalament et al already included the dripping of water onto the floor (column 8, lines 8-19), and since the floor drains and open reservoir of Hearne Jr (Figure 1, #114 & 117) would have provided an convenient means of containing this water while also preventing the floor and boxes from becoming wet.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed June 28, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Badalament et al do not teach a "fresh air exchanger unit". However, Badalament et al clearly disclose a fresh air exchanger unit in the form of the rear doors (column 6, line 45) which would contain the atmosphere when closed, as well as permit fresh air to enter when they were opened upon arrival at their destination which would coincide with the end of the ripening cycle.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., how the functions may be controlled) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues that Briscoe Jr et al do not teach a fresh air exchanger. However, Briscoe Jr et al clearly describe means for controlling the atmosphere within the container including fans, valves, and pumps for controlling atmospheric components (column 8, lines 12-63). Furthermore, Badalament et al teach a fresh air exchanger (column 6, line 45).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a

reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant argues that Briscoe Jr et al do not teach a control means for the drain. However, Briscoe Jr et al clearly teach a control means which controlled valves, relays, solenoids, and drainage return pumps (column 8, line 46).

### ***Conclusion***


7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. 8am-5pm and every other Fri. 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Drew E Becker  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1761

7-14-04